



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/773,356 | 02/01/2001 | Shinichi Miyazaki | 0033-0689P | 5541 |

7590 02/21/2003
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747

EXAMINER

FISCHER, JUSTIN R

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1733

DATE MAILED: 02/21/2003

98

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action

Application No.

09/773,356

Applicant(s)

MIYAZAKI ET AL.

Examiner

Justin R Fischer

Art Unit

1733

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 10 February 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 4 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 - (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
 - (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 - (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____.

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-8.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

8. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.
10. ☐ Other: _____

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant has amended the independent claims (1 and 4) to include a limitation that was previously required by dependent claim 3. As set forth in Paper Number 6, Paragraph 4, Nakamura suggests that corrosion resistance and dimensional stability can be improved in a steel cord by incorporating a wide variety of non metallic filaments or fibers, such as rubber, plastic, and organic materials. In particualr, Nakamura describes the use of polybutadiene, polyisoprene, styrene butadiene, polyethylene, and polypropylene (Table 1), which are the same materials described by the claimed invention. Thus, although Starinshak only discusses the use of a polybutadiene rubber to improve fatigue resistance and corrosion resistance (same benefits disclosed by Nakamura), one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have readily appreciated the use of additional materials, such as polyethylene or polypropylene, in view of Nakamura. Thus, Nakamura recognizes the ability to obtain the same benefits of Starinshak with additional non metallic materials, as compared to the polybutadiene rubber of Starinshak. Regarding the newly presented limitation of there being gaps between metallic filaments, it is clearly evident that upon melting, the non metallic filaments or fibers of Starinshak would produce gaps. Lastly, applicant contends that the non metallic filament of Starinshak is placed in the "core" of the cord while the claim requires that no "non metallic" filament constitutes a "core" of the cord. As stated in Paper Number 6, Paragraph 6, Starinshak discloses a 1x12 construction which is recognized in the tire and cord industries as not defining a core/sheath construction. Therefore, the non metallic fialments of Starinshak do not constitute a "core" of the cord.

Justin Fischer
4/19/03

Michael W. Ball
Michael W. Ball
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 1700